

NR_key_name: 7DE262D324A60D3F86256682000CBF12
SendTo: "Eileen Sullivan" <Eileen_Sullivan@jfk-arrrb.gov>
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB
From: "Michael T. Griffith" <MGriffith_2@compuserve.com>
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/17/1998
DisplayDate_Time: 2:14:22 AM
ComposedDate:
ComposedDate_Time:
Subject: Letter for Mr. Gunn

Michael T. Griffith 244 Beechfield Lane Augusta-Maine, ME 04307 September 10, 1998 Mr. T. Jeremy Gunn, Esq./c/o Ms. Eileen Sullivan Assassination Records Review Board Dear Mr. Gunn: I would like to ask a few questions regarding Floyd Riebe's deposition to the Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB), regarding your questioning of him, and, briefly, regarding your questioning of the other autopsy witnesses. My questions center on how Riebe eventually described the large head wound and on his deferring to the autopsy photos of the back of the head. When you first asked Riebe about the location of the large head wound, he said it was in the right rear part of the head (which is what Riebe had said in private taped interviews on the matter): A. The right side in the back was gone (indicating). Just a big gaping hole with fragments of scalp and bone hanging in it. Q. When you said that, you put your hand on the back of your head. A. The occipital. Q. The occipital area? A. Yes. (Deposition of Floyd Albert Riebe, May 7, 1997, pp. 44-45) However, it seems the more you asked him about the autopsy photos that show the occiput intact, the more he seemed to back away from his initial placement of the wound. When you presented to him the alleged autopsy photos that show the back of the head intact and then asked him if the condition of the back of the head in those photos differed from what he saw at the autopsy, Riebe said, "I don't think so, no" (Deposition, pp. 68-69). A short time later you asked him to explain the difference between his initial description and the back-of-the-head photos, to which he replied that he "just didn't remember it [the large wound] correctly" (Deposition, p. 71). Finally, toward the end of the deposition, you again asked him to explain the discrepancy, and he said, Well, it was chaos in that room that night, and I just misjudged where the wounds were. (Deposition, p. 77) Riebe's reversal on the position of the large head wound seems very surprising, in light of his previous statements on the subject. In previous audiotaped and videotaped interviews, Riebe said the following: * That the large head wound was in the right rear part of the head, i.e., in the right occipital-parietal region. He was insistent on this point. * That his memory of the location of the wound was clear--that the image of the wound had engraved itself in his mind and that he had no doubt about his recollection of the wound's location. * That the autopsy photos showing the occiput intact had been "phonied up." He was certain he did not take those photos, and he said they had been altered or faked. As I reviewed Riebe's ARRB deposition, one question that came to mind was why you didn't ask him about these previous statements of his. May I inquire as to why you didn't ask him about the stark contrast between his previous statements and his sudden deference to the autopsy photos? Given Riebe's previous declarations, his sudden reversal on this subject in the deposition does not seem credible. A large body of eyewitness testimony supports Riebe's previous repudiation of the back-of-the-head

Body:
recstat:
DeliveryPriority:
DeliveryReport:
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: